

Serial No.: 10/731,906

Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005

Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 13-43 are currently pending in this Application. All claims are currently rejected. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 16, 19, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32 and 37 are currently amended. Claims 38-43 have been newly added. Continued examination and reconsideration of the Application are respectfully requested.

I. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2007/0033221 to Copperman et al. ("Copperman"), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0123038 to Fenton et al. ("Fenton").

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to independent claims 1, 16, 24, 31 and 37, as will be discussed in further detail below, have overcome these rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a system that facilitates the association of data with a user, a first user context and a second user context, that includes a storage device adapted to store data and contextual metadata. The contextual metadata is associated with a) the user, b) a data component that is associated with one or more data operations being performed on the data, and c) a tagging component that automatically tags contextual information as the contextual metadata when the data is created, the contextual information being at least one of automatically generated information generated by the system upon creation of the data and automatically generated information generated by the system upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data. The system further includes a computer device linked via one or more communication links to the storage device, the computer device being adapted to execute a software tool configured to perform the steps of: performing one or

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the first user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the first user context to the data as contextual metadata; updating the contextual metadata based upon the one or more data operations; performing one or more data operations on the data by the user in the second user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the second user context to the data as contextual metadata; and updating the contextual metadata based upon the one or more data operations.

Claim 1 has been amended in part to clarify the user contexts associated with the system. For example, the amendments clarify at least the performing, automatic tagging and updating steps in relation to the first and second user contexts.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach a computer device linked via one or more communication links to the storage device, where the computer device is adapted to execute a software tool configured to perform the steps of: performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the first user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the first user context to the data as contextual metadata; updating the contextual metadata based upon the one or more data operations; performing one or more data operations on the data by the user in the second user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the second user context to the data as contextual metadata; and updating the contextual metadata

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not unpatentable in view of the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

In light of the amendments to independent claim 1, claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 12 have been amended to clarify which user context(s) is being referred to.

Claim 16, as amended, is directed to a system that facilitates the association of data with a user and a user context that includes a storage device adapted to store data and contextual metadata. The contextual metadata is associated with a) the user, b) a data component that is associated with one or more data operations performed by the user on the data in a context of the user, and c) a tagging component that automatically tags contextual information of the user as the contextual metadata when it the data is first saved, the contextual information being at least one of automatically generated information generated by the system upon creation of the data and automatically generated information generated by the system upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data. The system further includes a computer device linked via one or more communication links to the storage device, the computer device adapted to execute a software tool configured to perform the steps of: performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the user context to the data as contextual metadata; and updating the contextual metadata based upon the one or more data operations. The user context further includes a plurality of user contexts, and the contextual metadata is updated based on upon the one or more data operations occurring in any one of the plurality of user contexts.

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

Claim 16 has been amended in part to clarify the user contexts associated with the system. For example, the amendments clarify at least the performing, automatic tagging and updating steps in relation to a plurality of user contexts.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach a computer device linked via one or more communication links to the storage device, where the system further includes a computer device linked via one or more communication links to the storage device, and where the computer device is adapted to execute a software tool configured to perform the steps of: performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the user context to which the software tool is associated; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the user context to the data as contextual metadata; and updating the contextual metadata based upon the one or more data operations. Copperman and Fenton also fail to teach that the user context further includes a plurality of user contexts, and the contextual metadata is updated based on upon the one or more data operations occurring in any one of the plurality of user contexts.

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is not unpatentable in view of the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

Claims 17-23 depend from claim 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 24, as amended, is directed to a computer-implemented method that facilitates associating data with a user and a first user context and a second user context, that includes the steps of: initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first user context, wherein the user context is a digital workspace

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the first user context; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the first user context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations; initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the second user context, wherein the user context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the second user context; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the second user context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; and updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations.

Claim 24 has been amended in part to clarify the user contexts associated with the method. For example, the amendments clarify at least the initiating, performing, automatic tagging and updating steps in relation to the first and second user contexts.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach the aspects of: initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the second user context, where the user context is a digital workspace of events, subjects, relationships and/or resources associated with the user; performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the second user context;

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the second user context to the data, where the contextual information is information related to the second user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and/or information related to the second user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; and updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations.

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 24. Accordingly, claim 24 is not unpatentable in view of the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

Claims 25-30 depend from claim 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

In light of the amendments to independent claim 24, claim 28 has been amended to clarify which user context(s) is being referred to.

Claim 31, as amended, is directed to a computer-implemented method that facilitates associating data with a user, a first user context and a second user context, that includes the steps of: initiating a session on a computer system for the user in the first user context, wherein the first user context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; performing one or more data operations, by the user via the computer system, on the data while in the first user context; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the first user context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations; initiating a session on

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

the computer system for the user in the second user context, wherein the second user context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the second user context; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the second user context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations; and linking the user and one or more other users with the location of the data.

Claim 31 has been amended in part to clarify the user context associated with the method. For example, the amendments clarify at least the performing and automatic tagging steps in relation to the user context.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach at least the aspects of: performing one or more data operations, by the user, on the data while in the user context; and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the user context to the data, where the contextual information is information related to the user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and/or information related to the user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data.

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 31. Accordingly, claim 31 is not unpatentable in view of the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

Claims 32-35 depend from claim 31 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

In light of the amendments to independent claim 31, claim 32 has been amended to clarify which user context(s) is being referred to.

Claim 36 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method that facilitates associating data with a user, the method comprising: initiating a session on a computer system for a user in a user context, wherein the user context is a digital workspace of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; providing a collaboration data management tool for at least many-to-many functionality, the tool facilitates data operations on data related to at least one of data communications, data organization, data processing, and data storage; performing one or more data operations on the data; automatically tagging contextual information related to the user to the data, where the contextual information is information related to the user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and/or information related to the user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations; and linking the user with the location of the data.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach at least the aspect of providing a collaboration data management tool for at least many-to-many functionality, the tool facilitating data operations on data related to data communications, data organization, data processing, and/or data storage. Copperman and Fenton fail to disclose providing such a tool. Further, the Office action is silent as to this aspect.

Serial No.: 10/731,906

Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005

Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 36. Accordingly, claim 36 is not unpatentable in view of the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

Claim 37, as amended, is directed to a system that facilitates the association of data with a first user context and a second user context in a many-to-many data regime, that includes: computer-implemented means for initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first user context and the second user context, wherein the first user context and the second user context are each a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; computer-implemented means for performing one or more data operations on the data while in at least one of the first context and the second context; computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the first user context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the second user context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data; computer-implemented means for updating the contextual information based upon the one or more data operations; and computer-implemented means for linking the user with the location of the data.

Claim 37 has been amended in part to clarify the user contexts associated with the method. For example, the amendments clarify at least aspects of computer-implemented means for initiating a session on a computer system,

Serial No.: 10/731,906

Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005

Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

computer-implemented means for performing one or more data operations, computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information, and computer-implemented means for automatically tagging.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach at least the aspects of computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the second user context, where the contextual information is information related to the second user context generated automatically upon creation of the data and/or information related to the second user context generated automatically upon the one or more data operations being performed on the data.

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 37. Accordingly, claim 37 is distinct with respect to the Copperman and Fenton references, and is now allowable.

II. New Claims 38-43

Claims 38-43 have been newly added. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been introduced by these newly added claims.

Claims 38-39 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 40-41 depend from claim 24, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 43 is directed to a system that tags user-defined data with metadata that includes a storage device that stores the user-defined data and the metadata. The metadata includes information about a) the user, b) a

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

software application that creates data based upon one or more user interaction with the software application, and c) a tagging component that automatically tags the user-defined data with at least one of metadata related to the user, the software application and a web page associated with the software application when the user performs one or more data operations using the software application. The system also includes a computer device linked by one or more communication links to the storage device, the computer device adapted to execute a software program configured to perform the steps of: creating a first instance of user-defined data via user interaction with the software application in a first web page to which the application is associated; automatically tagging the first instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the first web page; updating the metadata based, at least in part, on the user interacting with the software application in the first web page; navigating to a second web page; creating a second instance of user-defined data via user interaction with the software application in a second web page to which the application is associated; automatically tagging the second instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the second web page; and updating the metadata based, at least in part, on the user interacting with the software application in the second web page.

Among other aspects, Copperman and Fenton fail to teach at least the aspects of a computer device linked by one or more communication links to the storage device, where the computer device is adapted to execute a software program configured to perform the steps of: creating a first instance of user-defined data via user interaction with the software application in a first web page to which the application is associated; automatically tagging the first instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the first web page; updating the metadata based, at least in part, on the user interacting with the software application in the first web page; navigating to a

Serial No.: 10/731,906

Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005

Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

second web page; creating a second instance of user-defined data via user interaction with the software application in a second web page to which the application is associated; automatically tagging the second instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the second web page; and updating the metadata based, at least in part, on the user interacting with the software application in the second web page.

Therefore, the combination of Copperman and Fenton fails to teach and every element of claim 43. Accordingly, claim 43 is in condition for allowance.


III. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 and 16-43, now pending, are distinguishable from the references cited, and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections of record is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3072.

If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Mancino
Reg. No. 39,289

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment

30074
Taft, Stettinius & Hollister LLP
425 Walnut Street; Suite 1800
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3957
mancino@taftlaw.com
(513) 357-9331